

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-12 are now pending in the application. Claims 1 and 8 are now amended. The claim amendments are fully supported by the application as filed and do not present new subject matter. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

## **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masanobu (JP 2000-147346) in view of Nguyen (U.S. Pat. No. 6,655,854). Claims 9-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Masanobu reference in view of Karnacewicz et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0081385). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Amended independent Claims 1 and 8 recite, in part and with reference to Figure 1 for exemplary purposes only as the invention includes numerous embodiments, a base member 40 having a mounting section 58. The mounting section comprises a first portion that is at least substantially perpendicular to a flexible substrate 32 and a second portion (located at the end of the lead line of reference numeral 58) that extends from the first portion and is at least substantially parallel to the flexible substrate and secured to the flexible substrate.

Due to the presence of the second portion, the contact between the base member 40 and the flexible substrate 32 is spread over a wide area. Therefore, when the base member 40 is mounted to the flexible substrate 32, the flexible substrate 32 is

less likely to bend and/or lean due to the weight of the base member 40. Such bending and/or leaning of the substrate 32 is undesirable because it may cause the optical axes of the lens 42 and the optical chip 10 to become misaligned.

The Masanobu reference appears to disclose, with reference to Figure 1, a fitting mechanism for a mold lens having a supporting part 22 that supports a mold lens 21 above a wiring board 25. The supporting part 22 includes a first portion on either side of the mold lens 21 that appears to be at least substantially perpendicular to the wiring board 25.

The Masanobu reference fails to disclose or alone suggest that the wiring board 25 is or can be a flexible substrate, as set forth in amended Claims 1 and 8. The outstanding Office Action confirms that the Masanobu reference fails to disclose or alone suggest this feature at page 2 of the outstanding Office Action.

The Masanobu reference also fails to disclose or alone suggest the supporting part 22 having a second portion extending from the supporting part 22 that is at least substantially parallel to a flexible substrate and secured to the flexible substrate, as set forth in amended Claims 1 and 8.

The point of contact between the supporting part 22 and the wiring board 25 appears to be concentrated at the terminus of the two portions of the supporting part 22 that are perpendicular to the wiring board 25. Therefore, if the supporting part 22 was mounted to a flexible substrate the weight of the supporting part 22 would likely cause the flexible substrate to bend and/or lean, thereby misaligning the vertical axes of the lens 21 and image sensor 27. As a result, the supporting part 22 is unsuitable for use with a flexible substrate as claimed in amended Claims 1 and 8.

The Nguyen et al. reference appears to disclose, with reference to Figure 3, a flexible substrate 208 between an optical base 212 and a photonic device 110.

The Nguyen et al. reference fails to disclose or alone suggest a base member having a mounting section, the mounting section comprising a first portion that is at least substantially perpendicular to a flexible substrate and a second portion extending from the first portion that is at least substantially parallel to the flexible substrate and secured to the substrate, as set forth in amended Claims 1 and 8.

As forth above, the Masanobu and Nguyen et al. references each fail to disclose or alone suggest the base member having a mounting section, the mounting section comprising a first portion that is at least substantially perpendicular to a flexible substrate and a second portion extending from the first portion that is at least substantially parallel to the flexible substrate and secured to the flexible substrate. Therefore, combination of the Masanobu and Nguyen et al. references fails to render obvious these features of amended Claims 1 and 8.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this Section 103 rejection of Claims 1 and 8 and those claims dependent therefrom.

### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt

and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Sept 12, 2005

By: 

G. Gregory Schirley, Reg. No. 27,382  
Bryant E. Wade, Reg. No. 40,344

Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

GGG/BGS/les